Chapter 3 Convolutional Codes and Trellis Coded Modulation



- 3.1 Encoder Structure and Trellis Representation
- 3.2 Systematic Convolutional Codes
- 3.3 Viterbi Decoding Algorithm
- 3.4 BCJR Decoding Algorithm
- 3.5 Trellis Coded Modulation



- Introduction
 - Encoder: contains memory (order *m*: *m* memory units);
 - Output: encoder output at time unit *t* depends on the input and the memory units status at time unit *t*;
 - By increasing the memory order m, one can increase the convolutional code's minimum distance (d_{min}) and achieve low bit error rate performance (P_b) ;
 - Decoding Methods:
 - Viterbi algorithm [1]: Maximum Likelihood (ML) decoding algorithm;
 - Bahl, Cocke, Jelinek, and Raviv (BCJR) [2] algorithm: Maximum *A Posteriori* Probability (MAP) decoding algorithm, used for iterative decoding process, e.g. turbo decoding.

[1] A. J. Viterbi, "Error bounds for convolutional codes and an asymptotically optimum decoding algorithm," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, IT-13, 260-269, April, 1967.

[2] L. R. Bahl, J. Cocke, F. Jelinek, and J. Raviv, "Optimal decoding of linear codes for minimizing symbol error rate," IEEE Trans, Inform. Theory, IT-20; 284-287, March, 1974.



0

§ 3.1 Encoder Structure and Trellis Representation

At time t_3

- The $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code
- Encoder structure: c_1



• Encoding Process: (Initialised state $s_0s_1 = 00$)

At time t_1





Code rate: $\frac{1}{2}$; Memory: m = 2; Constraint length: m + 1 = 3Output calculation: $c_1 = a \oplus S_0 \oplus S_1;$ $c_2 = a \oplus S_1;$ Registers update: $S_1 = S_0$. $S_0' = a$. 0 0





Input sequence $[m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4 m_5 m_6] = [1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]$ Output sequence $[c_1^1 c_1^2 c_2^1 c_2^2 c_3^1 c_3^2 c_4^1 c_4^2 c_5^1 c_5^2 c_6^1 c_6^2] = [11 \ 10 \ 00 \ 10 \ 11 \ 00]$



A state transition diagram of the $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code





Tree Representation of the $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code



Example 3.1 Determine the codeword that corresponds to message [0 1 1 0 1]



Trellis of the $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code



Remark: A trellis tells the state transition and IN/OUT relationship. It can be used to yield a convolutional codeword of a sequential input.

Example 3.2 Use the above trellis to determine the codeword that corresponds to message [0 1 1 0 1].



A number of conv. codes



Remark: A convolutional code's error-correction capability improves by increasing the number of the encoder states.



Remark: The encoder structure can also be represented by generator sequences or transfer functions.

Example 3.3: The $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code can also be written as: A rate 1/2 conv. code with generator sequences $g^{(0)} = [1 \ 1 \ 1], \qquad g^{(1)} = [1 \ 0 \ 1].$ A rate 1/2 conv. code with transfer functions: $g^{(1)}(x) = 1 + x + x^2, \quad g^{(2)}(x) = 1 + x^2.$



§ 3.2 Systematic Convolutional Codes

- The $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code's systematic counterpart is:



Remark: Systematic encoding structure is important for iterative decoding, e.g., the decoding of turbo codes.



§ 3.2 Systematic Convolutional Codes

For the $(1, 5/7)_8$ conv. code

State Table

IN	Current State	Next State	Out	ID
0	00	00	00	1
1	00	10	11	2
0	01	10	00	4
1	01	00	11	3
0	10	11	01	6
1	10	01	10	5
0	11	01	01	7
1	11	11	10	8





Let us extend the trellis of the $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code as if there is a sequential input.



- Such an extension results in a Viterbi trellis
- A path in the Viterbi trellis represents a convolutional codeword that corresponds to a sequential input (message).





- Decoding motivation: Given a received word \overline{R} , find the mostly likely codeword \hat{C} such that the Hamming distance $d_{Ham}(\overline{R}, \hat{C})$ is minimized.
- Since \overline{C} corresponds to a path in the Viterbi trellis, trace back the path of \overline{C} enable us to find out the message.
- Branch metrics: Hamming distance between a transition branch's output and the corresponding received symbol (or bits).
- Path metrics: Accumulated Hamming distance of the previous branch metrics.



Example 3.4. Given the $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code as in Examples 3.1-3.3. The transmitted codeword is $\bar{C} = [0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 01 \ 01 \ 00]$. After channel, the received word is $\bar{R} = [0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]$ 1 1 01 00]. Try to use the Viterbi trellis to decode it.

Step 1: Calculate all the branch metrics.





Step 2: Calculate the path metrics.



When two paths join in a node, keep the smaller accumulated Hamming distance.

When the two joining paths give the same accumulated Hamming distance, pick up one randomly.



Step 3: Pick up the minimal path metric and trace back to determine the message.

Tracing rules: (1) Trellis connection;

(2) The previous path metric should NOT be greater than the current path metric;

(3) The tracing route should match the trellis transition ID.



Decoding output: 0 1 1 0 1



Branch Metrics Table

0	2	2	1	0
∞	8	0	1	2
2	0	0	1	2
∞	∞	2	1	0
∞	1	1	2	1
∞	8	1	0	1
8	1	1	0	1
∞	∞	1	2	1

Path Metrics Table

0	0	2	3	2	2
∞	∞	3	1	1	3
∞	2	0	2	2	1
∞	∞	3	1	2	3

Trellis Transition ID Table

1	1	3	3	1
×	5	5	7	5
2	2	2	4	4
×	6	6	6	8



Soft-decision Viterbi decoding

• While we are performing the hard-decision Viterbi decoding, we have the scenario that two joining paths yield the same accumulated Hamming distance. This would cause decoding 'ambiguity' and performance penalty;

• Such a performance loss can be compensated by utilizing soft-decision decoding, e.g., soft-decision Viterbi decoding

Modulation and Demodulation (e.g., BPSK)

- Modulation: mapping binary information into a transmitted symbol;
- Demodulation: determining the binary information with a received symbol;





Modulation and Demodulation (e.g., BPSK)



Hard-decision: the information bit is 0. The Hamming distance becomes the Viterbi decoding metrics;

Soft-decision: the information bit has Pr. of 0.7 being 0 and Pr. of 0.3 bing 1. The *Euclidean distance (or probability)* becomes the Viterbi decoding metrics;

Euclidean Distance

Definition: The Euclidean distance between points *p* and *q* is the length of the line segment connecting them.

$$p(x_1, y_1) \bullet d_{Eud} = \sqrt{(x_1 - x_2)^2 + (y_1 - y_2)^2}$$



Example 3.5. Given the $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code as in Examples 3.1-3.3. The transmitted codeword is $\overline{C} = [0\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 0]$.

After BPSK modulation, the transmitted symbols are: (1, 0), (1, 0), (-1, 0), (-1, 0), (1, 0), (-1, 0), (1, 0), (-1, 0), (1, 0).

After the channel, the received symbols are: (0.8, 0.2), (1.2, -0.4), (-1.3, 0.3), (-0.9, -0.1), (-0.5, 0.4), (-1.0, 0.1), (1.1, 0.4), (-0.7, -0.2), (1.2, 0.2), (0.9, 0.3).







Step 2: Calculate the path metrics.



When two paths join in a node, keep the smaller accumulated Euclidean distance.



Step 3: Pick up the minimal path metric and trace back to determine the message.

Tracing rules: The same as hard-decision Viterbi decoding algorithm.



Decoding output: 0 1 1 0 1



Branch Metrics Table

0.53	3	2.53	1.76	0.42
∞	8	0.65	2.17	2.93
2.88	0.45	0.65	2.17	2.93
∞	∞	2.53	1.76	0.42
∞	1.95	2.10	2.74	2.68
∞	∞	1.56	1.10	1.94
∞	2.32	1.56	1.10	1.94
∞	∞	2.10	2.74	2.68

Path Metrics Table

0	0.53	3.53	5.48	5.25	5.67
∞	∞	4.83	3.08	3.64	6.65
∞	2.88	0.98	4.18	4.84	4.06
∞	∞	5.2	2.54	5.28	6.78

Trellis Transition ID Table

1	1	3	3	1
×	5	5	7	5
2	2	2	4	4
×	6	6	6	8



Free distance of convolutional code

- A convolutional code's performance is determined by its free distance.
- Free distance

$$d_{free} = \min\{d_{Ham}(\bar{C}_1, \bar{C}_2), \bar{C}_1 \neq \bar{C}_2\}$$

- With knowing $\bar{C}' = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0]$ is also a convolutional codeword.

$$d_{free} = \min\{weight(\bar{C}), \bar{C} \neq \mathbf{0}\}$$

Hence, it is the minimum weight of all finite length paths in the Viterbi trellis that diverge from and emerge with the all zero state.



Hence, it is the minimum weight of all finite length paths in the Viterbi trellis that diverge from and emerge with the all zero state.



Remark: Convolutional code with a large number of states will have a great d_{free} , and hence stronger error-correction capability.



Remark: Convolutional code is more competent in correcting spread errors, but not bursty errors.

E.g., with
$$\bar{R}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & e & 1 & e \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & e & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\bar{R}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & e & e & e & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$,

Viterbi algorithm is more competent in correcting received vector \overline{R}_1



- Hard-decision Viterbi algorithm: a Hard-In-Hard-Out (HIHO) decoding. Soft-decision Viterbi algorithm: a Soft-In-Hard-Out (SIHO) decoding.
 BCJR Algorithm: a Soft-In-Soft-Out (SISO) decoding.
- A Soft-In-Soft-Out (SISO) decoding algorithm that takes probabilities as the input and delivers probabilities as the output.
- With an attempt to deliver both the *a posteriori* probabilities of $P(c_t|\bar{y})$ and $P(m_{t'}|\bar{y})$, it is also called the maximum *a posteriori* (MAP) algorithm.
 - c_t convolutional coded bit, $t = 1, 2, \dots n$.
 - $m_{t'}$ information bit, $t' = 1, 2, \dots k$.
 - \overline{y} received symbol vector.



- In a trellis (e.g., trellis of the $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code).



The (IN, OUT, current state, next state) tuple happens as an entity.

That says at time instant t'

 Σ Prob [trellis transition w.r.t. an input θ] = Prob [$m_{t'} = \theta$], $\theta \in \{0, 1\}$.

 Σ Prob [trellis transition w.r.t. an output of θ] = Prob $[c_{t'}^{1(2)} = \theta], \theta \in \{0, 1\}.$

We seek to determine all the Prob [trellis transition w.r.t. an input of θ] at time t' to know

$$P(m_{t'} = \boldsymbol{\theta} \,| \bar{y})$$

We seek to determine all the Prob [trellis transition w.r.t. an output of θ] at time t' to know $P(c_{t'}^{1(2)} = \theta | \bar{y}).$



A Viterbi trellis snapshot at time instant t':



- For a rate half conv. code, $m_{t'} \rightarrow c_{t'}^1, c_{t'}^2$

- Trellis state transition probability: $(\Omega, \Omega') \in \{a, b, c, d\}$

$$\Gamma_{\Omega \to \Omega'} = P_a(m_{t'}) \cdot P_{ch}(c_{t'}^1) \cdot P_{ch}(c_{t'}^2)$$



- Determine the state transition probabilities.





- Determine the probability of each beginning state.



Probability of beginning a trellis transition $(\Omega \rightarrow \Omega')$ from state Ω (Determined by a forward trace).

$$A_{t'}(\Omega) = N_A \sum_{(\Omega_0, \Omega)} A_{t'-1}(\Omega_0) \cdot \Gamma_{\Omega_0 \to \Omega},$$

$$t' = 1, 2, \cdots, k.$$

 N_A : Normalization factor that ensures $A_{t'}(a) + A_{t'}(b) + A_{t'}(c) + A_{t'}(d) = 1.$

- Knowing the Viterbi trellis starts from the all-zero state, we initialize:

$$A_0(a) = 1$$
, and $A_0(b) = A_0(c) = A_0(d) = 0$.

- E.g., in the highlighted trellis transition

 $A_{t'}(a) = A_{t'-1}(a) \cdot \Gamma_{a \to a} + A_{t'-1}(b) \cdot \Gamma_{b \to a}.$



- Determine the probability of each ending state.



Probability of ending the trellis transition $(\Omega \rightarrow \Omega')$ at state Ω' (Determined by a backward trace).

$$B_{t'+1}(\Omega') = N_B \sum_{(\Omega', \Omega'')} B_{t'+2}(\Omega'') \cdot \Gamma_{\Omega' \to \Omega''}.$$

N_: Normalization factor that ensures

 $B_{t'+1}(a) + B_{t'+1}(b) + B_{t'+1}(c) + B_{t'+1}(d) = 1.$

- By ensuring after encoding, the shift registers (encoder) are restored to the all zero state (achieved by bit tailing), we can initialize:

 $B_{k+1}(a) = 1$, and $B_{k+1}(b) = B_{k+1}(c) = B_{k+1}(d) = 0$.

- E.g., in the highlighted trellis transition

 $B_{t'+1}(c)=B_{t'+2}(b)\cdot\Gamma_{c\to b}+B_{t'+2}(d)\cdot\Gamma_{c\to d}.$



Determine the *a posteriori* probability of each information bit



After the *Forward Trace* and **Backward Trace**, we obtain all the $A_{t'}(\Omega), B_{t'+1}(\Omega')$ and $\Gamma_{\Omega \to \Omega'}$ of each time instant t'. We can now determine the *a posteriori* probabilities $P(m_{t'}|\bar{y})$ for each information bit as



- E.g.,

$$\begin{split} P(m_{t'} = 0 | \bar{y}) &= N_P \cdot (A_{t'}(a) \cdot \Gamma_{a \to a} \cdot B_{t'+1}(a) + A_{t'}(b) \cdot \Gamma_{b \to a} \cdot B_{t'+1}(a) \\ A_{t'}(c) \cdot \Gamma_{c \to b} \cdot B_{t'+1}(b) + A_{t'}(d) \cdot \Gamma_{d \to b} \cdot B_{t'+1}(b)). \\ N_P &= P(m_{t'} = 0 | \bar{y}) + P(m_{t'} = 1 | \bar{y}). \end{split}$$

- Decision based on the *a posteriori* probabilities.

$$\hat{m}_{t'} = 0, \text{ if } P(m_{t'} = 0|\bar{y}) \ge P(m_{t'} = 1|\bar{y})$$
$$\hat{m}_{t'} = 1, \text{ if } P(m_{t'} = 1|\bar{y}) > P(m_{t'} = 0|\bar{y}).$$



Example 3.6. With the same transmitted codeword and received symbols of **Example 3.5**, use the BCJR algorithm to decode it.

With the received symbols, we can determine

$$\begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_1^1 = 0) = 0.83 \\ P_{ch}(c_1^1 = 1) = 0.17 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_1^2 = 0) = 0.92 \\ P_{ch}(c_1^2 = 1) = 0.08 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_2^1 = 0) = 0.07 \\ P_{ch}(c_2^1 = 1) = 0.93 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_2^2 = 0) = 0.14 \\ P_{ch}(c_2^2 = 1) = 0.86 \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_3^1 = 0) = 0.27 \\ P_{ch}(c_3^1 = 1) = 0.73 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_3^2 = 0) = 0.12 \\ P_{ch}(c_3^2 = 1) = 0.88 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_4^1 = 0) = 0.90 \\ P_{ch}(c_4^1 = 1) = 0.10 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_4^2 = 0) = 0.20 \\ P_{ch}(c_4^2 = 1) = 0.80 \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_5^1 = 0) = 0.92 \\ P_{ch}(c_5^2 = 1) = 0.14 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} P_{ch}(c_5^2 = 0) = 0.86 \\ P_{ch}(c_5^2 = 1) = 0.14 \end{cases}$$



Step 1: Determine $\Gamma_{\Omega \to \Omega'}$ of all transitions.





Step 2: Forward trace, determine $A_{t'}(\Omega)$ of values.





Step 3: Backward Trace, determine $B_{t'+1}(\Omega')$ of values.



Assume we know the trellis ends at state *c*.



Step 4: Determine the *a posteriori* probabilities of each information bit.

$ \begin{array}{l} P(m_1=0 \bar{y})=1.00\\ P(m_1=1 \bar{y})=0.00 \end{array} \end{array} $	\square	$\widehat{m}_1 = 0$
$ \begin{array}{l} P(m_2 = 0 \bar{y}) = 0.00 \\ P(m_2 = 1 \bar{y}) = 1.00 \end{array} \end{array} $		$\widehat{m}_2 = 1$
$\begin{cases} P(m_3 = 0 \bar{y}) = 0.00 \\ P(m_3 = 1 \bar{y}) = 1.00 \end{cases}$		$\widehat{m}_3 = 1$
$ \begin{array}{l} P(m_4=0 \bar{y})=1.00\\ P(m_4=1 \bar{y})=0.00 \end{array} \end{array} $		$\widehat{m}_4 = 0$
$P(m_5 = 0 \bar{y}) = 0.00$ $P(m_5 = 1 \bar{y}) = 1.00$		$\widehat{m}_5 = 1$



BER performance of $(7, 5)_8$ conv. code over AWGN channel using BPSK.





BER performance of different conv. code over AWGN channel using BPSK.





- Convolutional code enables reliable communications. But as a channel code, its error-correction function is on the expense of spectral efficiency.
- Spectral efficiency $(\eta) = \frac{Nr. of information bits}{transmitted symbol}$
- E.g., an uncoded system using BPSK

A rate 1/2 conv. coded system using BPSK

 $\eta = 1$ info bits/symbol

 $\eta = 0.5$ info bits/symbol

- Can we achieve reliable and yet spectrally efficient communication?

Solution: Trellis Coded Modulation (TCM) that integrates a conv. code with a high order modulation [3].

[3] G. Ungerboeck, "Channel coding with multilevel/phase signals," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. IT-28, pp. 55-67, 1982.



- A general structure of the TCM scheme





A rate 2/3 TCM code. -



Rate ¹/₂ 4-state Convolutional Code





- State table of the rate 2/3 TCM code

In	put	Currer	nt State	Next	State	Output			Symbol
<i>a</i> ₁	<i>a</i> ₂	S ₁	S ₂	S ₁ '	S ₂ '	<i>c</i> ₁	<i>c</i> ₂	<i>c</i> ₃	8PSK sym
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	6
0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	3
0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	5
1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	4
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	6
0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	3
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	5
1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7







- Set Partitioning 8PSK

By doing set partitioning, the minimum distance between point within a subset is increasing as: $\Delta_0 < \Delta_1 < \Delta_2$.





- Viterbi trellis of the rate 2/3 TCM code



For diverse/remerge transition:

$$d_{free}^{2} = \left[d^{2}(0,2) + d^{2}(0,1) + d^{2}(0,2) \right]$$

= $2\varepsilon' + (2 - \sqrt{2})\varepsilon' + 2\varepsilon' = 4.586\varepsilon'$

For parallel transition:

$$d_{free}^2 = d^2(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{4}) = 4\varepsilon'$$

Choose the smaller one as the free distance of the code:

$$d_{free}^2 = 4\varepsilon'$$

Remark: Bit $c_3 = 0$ and $c_3 = 1$ result in two parallel transition branches. By doing set partitioning, we are trying to maximize the Euclidean distance between the two parallel branches. So that the free distance of the TCM code can be maximized.



- Asymptotic coding gain over an uncoded system.
- Spectral efficiency $(\eta) = 2$ info bits/sym.



Asymptotic coding gain in $dB = 10 \log_{10} \gamma = 3 dB$.

Remark: With the same transmission spectral efficiency of 2 info bits/sym, the TCM coded system achieves 3 dB coding gain over the uncoded system asymptotically.